

surface strongly dentate; *brachium* subcostate behind, smooth, but marked with setiferous pores; smooth beneath and furnished with many setiferous pores along the hinder margin; anterior surface finely granular and sparsely denticulate; *manus* narrow, equalling in width the superior ridge of the "hand-back," with lightly convex but distinctly dentate and hairy inner margin, scarcely produced posteriorly; the upper surface ornamented with a reticulated pattern formed by the anastomosis of low smooth ridges; above the superior ridge of the "hand-back" the surface is subcostate; inferior surface mostly smooth, coarsely but sparsely granular in front, with two smooth keels; *dactyli* granular, costate and hairy; the movable dactylus slightly longer than the hand.

Legs.—The femora of the fourth pair feebly granular in front; for the rest the legs are almost entirely smooth and not costate; *coxae*, especially of the anterior two pairs, punctured.

Pectines short, projecting as far as the end of the fourth *coxae*; furnished with fourteen teeth.

Measurements in millimetres.—Total length 100·5; length of cephalothorax 15, width 15·5; length of tail 49, of first segment 6·5, of second 7·5, of third 8·2, of fourth 9·5, of fifth 12, of vesicle 6·5, of aculeus 4·5; width of first caudal segment 6·5, of fifth 4·5, of vesicle 4·5; length of humerus 13·7; *brachium*, length 14·5, width 5·3; width of hand 11; length of "hand-back" 10·5, of movable finger 16·5.

A single male specimen without special locality.

In the reticulated sculpturing of the hands this species resembles *Sc. indicus* (Linn.); but it is of much more slender build, with longer palpi, thinner hands, and longer tail. In the form of its palpi it approaches the male of *Sc. fulvipes*; but in this species the upperside of the hand is coarsely granular and subcostate.

X.—On *Ebalia nux*, *Milne-Edwards*. By R. I. POCOCK.

My attention has just been called to a passage on p. 316 of the last number of the 'Journal of the Marine Biological Association,' in which I regret to see that Canon Norman has taken occasion to charge me by implication with lack of courtesy for not giving what he considers due acknowledgment to the name he applied to the above Crustacean; and since such an accusation is likely to carry weight from such a source and to leave a wrong impression on the minds of readers not

acquainted with the facts of the case, I shall be glad to be permitted to say a few words on my own behalf to clear away any misapprehension that may have arisen.

When writing a report upon the Crustacea dredged by Mr. Green off the south-west coast of Ireland, I was naturally desirous of giving a reference to the original description of *Ebalia nux**—one of the species obtained. That the species had been described I did not at first for a moment doubt; for in more than one case I saw it quoted as *Ebalia nux*, Norman, without any insertion of the letters MS. Anyone, I think, who will take the trouble to “look up” the species in the ‘Museum Normanianum,’ in the *Brachyura* of the ‘Challenger,’ and in the first three of the works mentioned by Mr. Bourne in his useful list of the literature of the subject, will admit without hesitation that my conclusion was the obvious one to arrive at; for in every case it will be noticed that amongst several well-known species, to each of which is affixed its author’s name, *Ebalia nux*, Norman, is mentioned—just as if this species rested upon as secure a basis as the others and had the same right to recognition.

Since, however, in none of these places was there a reference to the original source of the name, I decided, very naturally, to apply to the fountain-head for the information I required. I consequently wrote to Canon Norman asking if he could kindly help me out of the difficulty; but since I received no reply to this letter, although I retained my manuscript as long as was possible in the expectation of being favoured with one, I was obliged to have the paper printed as it now stands*. But whilst awaiting an answer from Canon Norman I had discovered that Prof. Carus, in his ‘*Prodromus*,’ mentions *Ebalia nux*, Norm., and that he inserts after the name the words “*species nondum descripta*.” This was the first intimation I had that the crab in question had been hitherto known by a manuscript name. Having learnt this, it seems to me that, in writing on the species, I adopted the only plan that common sense and common courtesy alike suggested, *i. e.* I described the species as new and gave Canon Norman the credit of it by retaining the name he proposed and by subjoining the words “*Ebalia nux*, Norman, MS.” How by thus acting I overstepped the bounds of courtesy I confess my inability to see. It appears to me that I gave to his species all the acknowledgment Canon Norman could possibly expect, and that at the same time I represented the facts of the case in a perfectly courteous and intelligible

* Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. iv. pp. 425–431 (1889).

manner. This being so, I was not a little surprised to see Canon Norman's comment on the praiseworthy conduct of Messrs. Marion and Milne-Edwards and the reflection that it cast upon my own; nor, when I thought over the implied accusation against me of discourtesy, could I help feeling slightly amused as the recollection of my letter passed through my mind. But if I were to assume that Canon Norman received my letter and had not the—shall I say?—courtesy to answer it, and were to suggest that if my mode of dealing with his manuscript name was discourteous his treatment of my letter is deserving of a much harsher epithet, I think the assumption would be very unjust and the suggestion a very unmannerly one. I shall consequently make neither, but shall conclude that my letter never reached its destination; for seemingly this is the only conclusion that explains to Canon Norman's credit the fact that the sole reply received to my private letter was a public, though guarded, accusation of discourtesy.

XI.—On some new Species of African Lycænidæ in the Collection of Philip Crowley, Esq. By EMILY MARY SHARPE.

Fam. Lycænidæ.

Genus PSEUDALETIS.

Pseudaletis trifasciata, sp. n.

Similar to *P. clymenus*, Druce, but differing in the extent of the black border on the fore wing, which reaches from the costa to the submedian nervure; this black portion of the wing is relieved by two white spots, one at the end of the discoidal cell, while the second is oval and extends from the first discoidal or radial nervure, then slanting slightly down to the third median nervure.

There is a white patch along the inner margin of the fore wing, extending a little above the submedian nervure.

The hind wing has a broad border of black along the margin to the internal nervure, with a broad black bar from the end of the costal nervure to the border.

The underside has this bar distinctly marked, with a second black bar from the base of the hind wing to the submedian nervure; there is a third bar which begins from the inner